

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/892,139	09/892,139 06/26/2001		Yasuhiko Mizushima	P/1878-171	1950
32172	7590	02/07/2006		EXAM	INER
		RO MORIN & OS E AMERICAS (6T	PHAN, HANH		
41 ST FL.	OE OF I	E AIVIERICAS (61.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714				2638	•

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/892,139	MIZUSHIMA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hanh Phan	2638
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 1, cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 No.</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1.5,6 and 8-11 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1.5,6 and 8-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any accomplicate may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the toding on the toding of the drawing	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) \(\osemall \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) \(\osemall \) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)	atent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2638

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 11/18/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diamantstein et al (US Patent No. 4,826,274) in view of Staiger (US Patent No. 6,628,441) and further in view of Norte (US Patent No. 5,963,349).

Regarding claims 1 and 10, referring to Figures 1-3, Diamantstein teaches an optical data bus communication system of an artificial satellite, comprising:

a plurality of first devices, each of which is equipped with an optical transmitter (i.e., photoemiters 3, Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 40-67 and col. 3, lines 1-57) each transmitter transmitting optical signals;

a reflection means (i.e., optical waveguide 1, Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 40-46) that is provided on the entire inner surface of, or at prescribed locations inside, the case of the artificial satellite; and

a plurality of second devices, each of which is equipped an optical receiver (i.e., photodetectors 4, Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 40-67 and col. 3, lines 1-57) that receives optical

Art Unit: 2638

signals that are transmitted from the optical transmitters (i.e., photoemitters 3, Fig. 1) both directly and after reflection and diffusing by the reflection means (i.e., optical waveguide 1, Fig. 1), each receiver receiving optical signals and reproducing the optical signals from these received signals lines.

Diamantstein differs from claims 1 and 10 in that he fails to specifically teach each optical transmitter transmitting signals of a different wavelength and each optical receiver receiving optical signals of a different wavelength. However, Staiger in US Patent No. 6,628,441 teaches a bidirectional optical bus system without interference between the optical signals (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 65-67 and col. 6, lines 1-24) and Norte in US Patent No. 5,963,349 teaches a bidirectional optical transmission system wherein each optical transmitter transmitting signals of a different wavelength (i.e., optical transmitter 101 transmits an optical wavelength λ1 and optical transmitter 151 transmits an optical wavelength λ2, Fig. 1) and each optical receiver receiving optical signals of a different wavelength (i.e., optical receiver 102 receives an optical wavelength $\lambda 2$ and optical receiver 152 receives an optical wavelength $\lambda 1$, Fig. 1) (see col. 2, lines 56-67 and col. 3, lines 1-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the each optical transmitter transmitting signals of a different wavelength and each optical receiver receiving optical signals of a different wavelength as taught by Staiger and Norte in the system of Diamantstein. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Staiger suggests in column col. 5, lines 65-67 and col. 6, lines 1-24 and Norte suggests in column col. 2, lines 56-67 and col. 3, lines 1-60 that using such the each

Art Unit: 2638

optical transmitter transmitting signals of a different wavelength and each optical receiver receiving optical signals of a different wavelength have advantage of allowing providing an bidirectional optical transmission system with high speed and high capacity and reducing the interference between the optical signals.

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Diamantstein, staiger and Norte teaches the optical transmitter is equipped with a wide-angle LED as a light source for transmission, and the optical receiver is equipped with a wide-angle photodiode for receiving light emitted from the LED (see Fig. 1 of Diamantstein and Fig. 1 of Staiger).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Diamantstein, staiger and Norte teaches the reflection means is a polygon reflection mirror (see Fig. 1 of Diamantstein and Fig. 1 of Staiger).

4. Claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Diamantstein et al (US Patent No. 4,826,274) and Staiger (US Patent No. 6,628,441) in view of Norte (US Patent No. 5,963,349) and further in view of Ohhata et al (US Patent No. 6,304,357).

Regarding claims 8 and 11, Diamantstein as modified by Staiger and Norte teaches all the aspects of the claimed invention except fails to specifically teach the optical receiver comprises an again control means and a pulse width shaping means for converting electrical signals of a required level that are converted by the gain control means to digital signals of a prescribed pulse width. However, Ohhata in US Patent No. 6,304,357 teaches an optical receiver comprises an 0/E converter for converting

Art Unit: 2638

received optical signals to electrical signals, again control means for converting electrical signals that are converted by the 0/E converter to electrical signals of a required level; and a pulse width shaping means for converting electrical signals of a required level that are converted by the gain control means to digital signals of a prescribed pulse width (Fig. 1, col. 1, lines 10-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the optical receiver comprises an 0/E converter for converting received optical signals to electrical signals, again control means for converting electrical signals that are converted by the 0/E converter to electrical signals of a required level; and a pulse width shaping means for converting electrical signals of a required level that are converted by the gain control means to digital signals of a prescribed pulse width as taught by Ohhata in the system of Diamantstein modified by Staiger and Norte. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Ohhata suggests in column 1, lines 10-44 that using such the optical receiver comprises an 0/E converter for converting received optical signals to electrical signals, again control means for converting electrical signals that are converted by the 0/E converter to electrical signals of a required level; and a pulse width shaping means for converting electrical signals of a required level that are converted by the gain control means to digital signals of a prescribed pulse width has advantage of allowing increasing the power level of signal to a constant level and providing an optical receiver with high sensitivity and wide dynamic range.

Art Unit: 2638

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Diamantstein, Staiger, Norte and Ohhata teaches the pulse width shaping means comprises: a comparator that takes output of the gain control means as one input and a reference voltage as another input and, based on the positive or negative of the difference between these inputs, converts electrical signals of a required level that are output from said gain control means to digital signals; and a sampling means that performs sampling by a sampling signal of a prescribed frequency to convert digital signals that are converted by said comparator to digital signals of a prescribed pulse width (Fig. 1of Ohhata, col. 1, lines 10-44).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 6 and 8-11 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Phan whose telephone number is (571)272-3035.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Vanderpuye, can be reached on (571)272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/892,139 Page 7

Art Unit: 2638

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-4700.

HANH PHAN PRIMARY EXAMINER